L' Present

App. F. IX-4

Previous References
1 29-1-9.

1932
(Muzrai)

File No. 272-32
Serial Nos. 1 5

Later References
Rev 8-3-1-2.
Law 9-34-1-5

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for December 1933

SUBJECT.

Appeal praying for the restoration of Jodi Shetahalli village belonging to Sri Avani Mutt to Ramaguru murthi of Sidlaghatta

---

8L9

Do. Ramaguru murthi of
Sidlaghatta
No. 394 of 5-10-33.

Draws his attention to the endorsement
No 1795 of 16-6-33 & states that his request
Cannot be granted

RS

Serial No.	
1	Petition dt 25/2/33 from Mr Ramaswami Mudaliar stating that he filed an appeal about three years back in Thattahalli, a village near Kottapalla belonging to the Avani Matt Mudaliyal Jaladi was taken away from his possession from him by the concerned authorities, that the appeal is still pending and praying for reasons set forth therein the previous orders of Government referred to therein be Continued giving to him possession the said Village.
	(1) Some time ago The petr filed Suit No — Court for a decree declaring him entitled to possession of the said village. The Additional Dt Judge Bangalore in a case filed by the Ramaswami Mudaliar on the Subject. On return of the Writ — Dt the case fully referred & remanded for disposal to the Court below — dt 23rd Sept 1913 — Yrs Evans please 2/10/13
S x	The petitioner refers in para 7 of his Petn dt 25/2/33 to Govt Order No 1611/Mis 562-28-169 25/10/32 issued to him from here & the file bearing No This is perhaps. Twelve days before issuing the order, an order was passed directing that Thattahalli village belonging to Avani Matt be restored to Ramaswami the petitioner. (Vide para 2 of G.O. No

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0216 —GPB—15,000—22-8-32

15-16-7 / Mem 562-20-15 dy 12/10/22). The proprietor of the permanent lease of this Thathakalli Village was later enstated on 30/5/28 (vide minutes in paras 17 & 18 in Mem 150-27-10). The discussion thereon was continued in Mem 310-28-1 - In accordance with legal opinion in paras 6 & 7 in the file above Mem directed to be taken to restore the Main Village to the tenant and to obtain the best income possible from the tenant. (Vide no 1736/Mem dy 28/2/29 to the M.C). N

In the meanwhile on 24/6/29 the Advocate for the late tenant files a petition before the First Member of enquiry praying for orders being issued permitting Rama Gurukkalmakkal the heirs to continue in undisturbed possession of the Thathakalli Village. Z

On 6/6/30 the petitioner instituted a civil suit wherein he is claimed the Amsham of Sooda Gramam as the 1st Defendant & the Sree Avani Mandi as the Second Defendant - before the Sub Judge who heard the case. The Additional Sub Judge held on 22/12/32 that the suit is not maintainable in the Civil Courts & dismissed the suit with Costs of the Defendants -

As regards the appeal stated in para 8 of the P.U. it is pending here.

Mem Petn is invited to the note

Serial No.

4.

and ors in pmas 40-43 of the 10-29 Inam ferrage. As he resisted he the civil Court for remedy after filing an appeal here, instructions were issued to the M.C. to oppose the resumption proceedings & the case was thus closed. This respectfully begs that the petitioner's Statement that his appeal is pending here for the past 3 years is incorrect for reasons stated above. As his prayer for confirmation the orders of 1905 & 12/10/22 Govt to leave him in undisturbed possession of the Inam Village is not tenable.

5 For orders —

GV

D/5/

6 The points urged by the petr for Consideration are :-

1) That Inam Thattahalli Village belonging to Sri Swami Mutt be confirmed to him as per G.O. of 12.10.22 intimated to him on 25.10.22 (Flags O & S).

and 2) That the amount due to him from the Mutt be ordered to be adjusted from the fotal Amount payable by him in respect of the above Inam Village.

7) In Support of (1) he States that in Spite of the G.O. of 1922 the Village was resumed to Govt in pursuance of a notice issued to him in 1929 and that as

NOTE—Contn Sheet

his appeal in the matter was not disposed of & he was kept in Suspense, he Sought relief in the Dt Judge's Court by filing a Suit against the Govt & the Munsif. He also Met the Suit was dismissed as not maintainable.

The circs under which the order of 1922 was reconsidered & modified are explained in detail in para 18 of the note in Mung file No 150-27-10 of 27, Q. in the Members minutes dt 14.8.28 & the Legal Remembrancer's opinion dt 14.2.29 contained in pages 1 to 11 of the note in Mung file No. 310-28-1 of 28-29. The Mg. was then asked to take very prompt action and report the action taken for restoring the Iram Village to the Mudk and for obtaining from it the best income possible for the Munk". This was communicated to the Mg. in this office letter dt 25.2.29 If this had been Communicated as a go. in modification of the go. of 1922, the petrs Could not have urged his request as he have done now. Anyway the petrs request re the Thattakalli Village being Confirmed to him as per order of 1922 is out of question. He may be informed that his request cannot be granted.

As regards the appeal refd to by him (Flag Z) it will be kindly seen that it was presented on 29.6.29. A kind perusal of the notes in Mungai file No 10 of 29 will show that after

Serial No.

The Member had ordered that the case may be heard Some day in July 29, yet this could not be done as the Records called for from the Dist. were not rec'd till 24.4.30. On the 2nd May 30 the Member ordered the case being posted for hearing Vide paras 24 & 25 of the note in the same file but before this could be done letter No. C 1452 dt 5.5.30 was rec'd from the Dist. Stating that the party had issued a notice to the Amildar Sidhapur Taluka threatening to file a Suit against the order of resumption of the Village. On this legal advice was taken, as upon which to advise was given, the threatened Suit was awaited and resumption proceedings were ordered to be expedited. The case was not posted for hearing and the records of the Dist. were retd (Vide Flag L) Now that the decision of the Dy. Secy (Flag M) has been unfavourable to him the petr is writing to the appeal and seeks review here. If Approved the petr may be informed that his request cannot be granted.

Re (2) the question has been finally disposed of in Member's order dt 30.5.25 (Flag G) & Communicated to the petr on 5.6.25.

JL Seary)
22nd May

12/5/33

I agree R 31/5
31/5

SP
31/5

Chief Secretary to Government Second Member of Council 2 JUNE 1933 No. 6.1.774

Linked file (D. No 948/24-33 (Law 115-32) is attached

NOTE—Continuation Sheet

Seen
6/6

Mus 3 File No. 272 of 1932 | Ge an Secretariat

For orders if a Dft. G.O. modifying the orders passed in para 2 of G.O. No 1516-7/ Mus 3 562-20-15 dy 12/10/22 may be put up or merely an endorsement to the petitioner declining the grant of his request. in D.U.D.

G.S. 7/6. 1. An endorsement to the petitioner as indicated in para 10/24 supra will suffice

Yes 9/6/33

9/6/33

1 Dft. Endt. Submd.

G.S. 13/6

14/6

No 1796 dy 16.6.33 to Mus 2

Ramanaguru mookaiya - Siddaghatta intimating that his request referred to in his petition cannot be granted

Memo No 1796 dy 16.6.33 to the Mus 3 Commissioner forwarding copy of the above endorsement for information.

Petition addressed to the Dewan received on 6-9-33. from Mr. Ramanaguru mookaiya of Siddaghatta praying for a reconsideration of orders passed by him in regard of Todi Tattahalli Village endowed to Sri Ananteshwara.

PING SECTION
15 JUN 1933
GNL & REV SECTT

Serial No.

19 Vide notes and orders in paras 6 to 13 supra. It is noted that no new grounds have been urged for a [illegible] of orders already passed in the matter. Refer for orders—

Sd/ [illegible]
17/9 H Secy) 20 Recd 18/9/33

21 There are no new grounds adduced to reconsider the decision already given. Necessary endorsement may issue to Park, inviting his attention to [illegible] endorsements dated

16.9.33

2) Member)

Second Member's Council.
1 SEP. 1933
No. 1.6.S.9.

22) Sd/
20/9

Sd/ 22/9/33

23

Sd/
29/9

Sd/ 30/9

30 Endorsement No 39405—10.33 to Mr. R. A. Park inviting his attention to the previous Endorsements issued in this case on the subject and intimating that his [illegible] case not be reconsidered.

Sd/ 3/10

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Revenue
Village — Belongers
27.2

File No. of 1 3 Sec

Petition of 31-10-33 and
Received here from the Revenue Board
on 17/11/33 from Mr Ramaswami Naicker
of Pudukkottai praying for
Tooi Thalaiyaci Village belonging
to Sri Avani Avittam being
Confirmed on him.

The petition has been
replied in all its aspects - vide
orders in paras 21 & 22 supra on
a memorial from the gentleman
on the subject. He has since
then once been told that
his request is inadmissible
being for more —

G.S
25/11

Petnr may be informed
that his request cannot be
considered. For details of the
Case & grounds reference is invited to paras 6 to 12
of the order dtd 27/11/33

Petng)
2nd. MN)

30/11
30/11
3/12
4/12

Seal of Court
30
No.....

Endn portion is for approval and Kind Signature
5/12
7/12

Endorsement to the Petition No 803 & 42-33

Mis 227-32

TWO RUPEES ೨ರೂ-೦

1/2/3/33

TO Mus Revenue Dept. Dis. No. 123

The Dewan of Mysore,

Bangalore

GENL. & REV. SECT-T
941
1 - MAR. 1933
MYSORE.

Ingrai Secretary to Government
With Compliments
BO

Petitioner:-- Ramagurumurthiah,
Sidlaghatta,
(Kolar District.)

****

PRIVATE SECRETARY,
TO THE DEWAN OF MYSORE.

Respected Sir,

I, the undersigned Petitioner, beg to state as follows:-

1. Thattahalli, a Village near Sidlaghatta, belongs to the Avani Mutt of Kulbagal Taluk.

2. This was a Bechrak Village. About 80 years ago, the Swamijee of the above Mutt - leased the Village to my father on Guthige, (on 10 years' Lease), who improved the same. Thus the Village continued in our possession for 40 years, on Four Renewed Leases.

3. Then, it became difficult for the - Ryots to live in the Village without constructing Tanks and digging wells for purposes of cultivation. The then Swamiji, realising that the Mutt was not in a position to do all this, executed a Registered Permanent Lease "ಶಾಶ್ವತಕ್ರಯ" in favour of us, for Rs.400/- annually, authorising us to - spend at our own cost all the necessary expenses for the improvement and proper yield in the said village.

3. One

4. One Sreepathiah complained to Government that the Swamijee had no powers to execute such leases and that it should be cancelled. Government was pleased to refer the matter to the - Deputy Commissioner and the Executive Engineer to examine the improvement of the Village in person and report the same after an investigation. The said Authorities have taken the statement of the Swamijee. The Swamijee has said that the Lease was for the benefit of the Mutt and that the same should be confirmed permanently.

5. Then an Endorsement was granted to Sripathiah by Government that the lease executed by - the Swamijee was just and proper and that Government finds no reason to interfere with the same. A Copy of the Order is herewith annexed, and the same is dated 11th March,1905.

6. On the strength of this Endorsement and confirmation by the Government, I have spent about 10 Thousand Rupees for the construction and improvement of two Tanks and the Wells in the said Village.

7. In 1920, the Government of Mysore took over the management of the Mutt and gave a Notice to me to quit, whereupon I produced the copies of the previous orders of the Government, and the Government was pleased to confirm the previous order and my possession & enjoyment of the same Village (Thattahalli). A Copy of the above Order dated 25th Oct., 1922, Muz. No.562-20-16, is herewith produced.

8. In

8. In spite of these two previous orders of the Government, I was once again served with a Notice to quit, on 1929, and the Authorities have taken possession in pursuance of ~~them~~ this Notice, for which I have preferred an Appeal to the Council, which is pending for the last 3 years.

9. As nothing was decided and as I was kept in suspense, I filed a Civil Suit in the District - Judge's Ccurt, also, as advised by some Lawyers, which was dismissed as not maintainable on the Orders of the Muzrai Commissioner.

10. The Swamijee (who is now dead) took a Loan from me in 1915, for His Holiness' Tour, a sum of Rs.2,000/- in the shape of Silver Vessels, carts & bullocks, and also borrowed Rs.1,680/- for paying the Kandayam to Government; Thus, for a sum of Rs.3,680/- His Holiness mortgaged a Khayamgutta Village named Yegaganahalli. Thus, out of Rs.800/- that I have to pay, for the said two villages, the said Swamijee had agreed by the said Registered Mortgage Deed (after deducting the amount payable to Government for the two villages as Jodi), to adjust the balance towards the Principal due to me.

11. But, I was directed by the Deputy Commissioner to pay the above Gutta amount to Government and seek remedy in a Civil Court for the amount due to me by the Swamijee, whereupon I filed a Suit against the Mutt,which was dismissed in spite of strong evidence on my side, on a Technical ground.

12. The

12. The Village of Thattahalli is with the Government Management for the last 3 years, but the yield has not been on any one year - Rs.400/-, which I used to pay.

Therefore, I most humbly pray that the two previous orders of Government, passed on proper enquiry and deliberation, be confirmed, - thus giving possession of the said Village to me, and that the amount due to me by the Mutt be adjusted annually by the Gutta amount payable to the Mutt when the Village is handed over to me, and - thus I may be allowed to realise my large amount - justly due to me by the Mutt, without any detriment or loss to both sides; for which act of - kindness, I shall ever remain grateful to you.

I beg to remain,
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Bangalore,
Dated: 25-2-1933.

Petitioner.

No.3874. Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department,
Dated, Bangalore, 11th March 1905.

ENDORSEMENT granted to Sripatiah, Shanbogue of the Jodi village of Thathahalli in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, in reply to his petitions ending with registered No. 1337 dated 18-2-1895 complaining that the Jodi village of Thathahalli endowed to the Sri Avani Matt, has been leased out by the Matt in perpetuity to Ramasubba Bhatta to be enjoyed by him and his heirs and praying that the village may be taken under Government management.

Petitioner is informed that as it has been ascertained from the local authorities that the conditions of the lease of the village to Ramasubba Bhatta are fair and equitable considering the amounts spent on improving the lands Government decline to interfere in thematter.

By Order,
Sd/- L. Anantasami Rao,
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

"Copy"

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
General and Revenue Secretariat.

No. 1611/Enc.thirteen. Dated,Bangalore,25th Octr.22
Muz. 562-20-16.

ENDORSEMENT.

Endorsement granted to Rama Gurumurtiah son of Rama Subba Bhatta, Siddlaghatta, with reference to his marginally noted petitions appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order directing the resumption of Jodi Thatahalli village in the Siddlaghatta Taluk and inam Honnenahalli village in the Kolar Taluk.

No.	date.
2337	10-5-1921.
586)	
584)	19-8-1921.
2523	21-8-'21.
3708	2-3-1922.

The petitioner is informed that orders of Government have been issued in Proceedings No.1516-7/Muz.562-20-15 dated 12th October 1922 directing the restoration to him of the Jodi village of Thatahalli in the Siddlaghatta Taluk, and confirming the Deputy Commissioner's order directing the resumption of the Inam Honnenahalli village in the Kolar Taluk.

2. The enclosures to his petitions are herewith returned.

By Order,
Sd/- T. E. Jayarama Aiyar,
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

==========

"Copy"

2) Mr. The amount due to
him from Sri Avani Bhatt

endix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mug

File No. 272-32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... No. 1785

To M/s Ramaguru moorthaiya
Soolagalea
Kolar Dt.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 16/6/33

Signed by Sd/- B. Muddukrishnappa

(1) Inam Thattekallu village belonging to Sri Avani Mudi be confirmed to the petitioner.

2) That the amount due to him from Sri Avani Mudi be ordered to be adjusted from the grain amount payable by him on account of Rent alone Inam Lease.

Yr letter dated 25/2/33 regarding the marginally noted points, Mr. Ramaguru moorthy is informed that his request cannot be granted.

B. D

14/6/33

For 21 Sec

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

1786 dt 16-6-33

Copy to him for information

J. D

For 21

6 SEP 3
No. ...

MS 272-XI-3

TWO R

5.9.33
339

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SIR MIRZA MAHOMED ISMAIL, K.T., C.I.E., O.B.E.
Dewan to the Government of Mysore,
(In London).

Transfer Secretary to Government with Compliments

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT 277 SEP. 1933 MYSORE

MEMORIAL OF RAMAGURUMURTHIAH, SIDLAGHATTA.

Most Respected Sir,

I respectfully beg to bring to your benign consideration, the following:-

5.9.33

Jodi Tatahalli village is an Inam village endowed to the Sri Avani Mutt, Mulbagal Taluk, Kolar District. It was a bechirak village hardly yielding Rs 60/- or 70/- per annum to the Mutt. About 70 years ago, the then Sri Swamigalu of the Mutt entrusted the village to the management of my father for a lease of Rs 100/- per annum. My father brought about 4 to 5 families to improve the village by giving them loans for bullocks, living etc. The rental of the village was being increased decennially until 1890 when it stood at Rs 300/- per annum to the Mutt.

Subsequently owing to continued failure of rains, the agricultural families were about to leave the village for want of water etc. Then Sri Swamigalu

Swamigalu was approached to create some water facilities for drinking and cultivation purposes. His Holiness Sri Swamigalu having been unable to improve the village by sinking wells, permanently leased out the village to my father at a rental of Rs 400/- per annum; and executed a lease deed in his favour. Accordingly he undertook the sinking of wells and the construction of the tank.

At that time one Sripathiah, Shanbhog petitioned to Government, that the permanent alienation of the Devadaya village was irregular and that it should be cancelled. The matter was enquired into and the village and improvements made were inspected by the Deputy Commissioner in the company of the Executive Engineer and the then Sri Swamigalu was also enquired into and then he reported that the action of the Swamigalu was beneficial to the Mutt. The Government accordingly dismissed the petition finding no reason to interfere with this arrangement made by the Sri Swamigalu.

Being thus assured of the continuance of the lease, two tanks and 20 wells and a temple at an aggregate cost of Rs 12,000/- were constructed and sunk. The debt so incurred still remains due and a heavy interest of

nearly

nearly Rs 1000/- is being paid. In the year 1920, the Government ordered the resumption of all the villages as having been alienated unauthorisedly. In the light of the previous Government Order, the Government after enquiry decided that the lease should continue. Thus the matter came up to Government on two occasions and the lease was continued perpetually.

The matters having stood thus, once again in the year 1930, a notice was served upon me directing me to hand over the village to Government management. I appealed to the Member of the Council for kind reconsideration in view of the previous Government Orders. No orders were passed for 3½ years and the village was taken possession of.

Having been thus disappointed, I approached your esteemed Self on the 25th February 1933 and brought to your kind notice the gross injustice done to me and prayed the matter should receive your kind consideration and your magnanimous self was so much pleased to express that you would look into the matter personally. But to my sad disappointment, you were called on for the greater task in this enlightened world for some great political --

achievement to India and went away for the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee in London.

For my petition presented to you, an endorsement has been issued without hearing me declining to revive the orders already passed. The copy of the same is -- enclosed for your kind perusal.

I most humbly pray you, to kindly consider my hard case and on return to India, I may kindly be heard and after perusal of my records, mete out justice so long denied to me.

The humble petitioner is anxiously awaiting the early return of your benign Self.

So is the memorial of your Humble Servant.

P E T I T I O N E R.

Bank Agent,

Sidlaghatta.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 394 Revenue S-12

Dated, Bangalore, 3rd October 33.

Muz 272-32-4 ENDORSEMENT.

Mr. Ramagurumoortiah,
Siddlaghatta, Kolar District.

With reference to his memorial presented to the Dewan on 5th September 1933, praying for a reconsideration of orders issued in No.1795/Muz.272-32-2 dated 16th June 1933, regarding Thathahalli Inam Village belonging to Sri Avani Mutt, Mr. Ramagurumoortaiya's attention is invited to the previous endorsements issued in the matter of his request and he is informed that his request cannot be considered. The Endorsement of 16th June 1933 annexed to the petition is returned herewith.

By Order,

for Financial Secretary to Government.

F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mu 3

File No. 272-32

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... Encl No. 394 Revenue

To

Mr Ramaguru moorthi

Sivalaghatta Kolar Dt

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Memorial

Date of issue 5/10/33 In reply to his ~~letter~~ presented on 5/9/33.

to the ~~Board~~ Govt praying

for a re-consideration of orders

issued in no 14957/Mu 3 272-32-2

dy 16.6.33 re. Thathahalli

Inam Village belonging

to Sri Avani Mulla, the

Ramaguru moorthi's ~~petition~~

attention is invited to the ~~Proc~~

~~informed that there are no~~

previous Endts issued in the matter of his

~~new grounds adduced~~

List of enclosures ..... Copies and informed that his request

cannot be ~~considered~~ considered. ~~The petitioner~~

~~has already favoured in the~~

Copied by .... ~~matter~~. The Endt of 16.6.33

annexed to the petn is returned

Examined by .... herewith.

R-O

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

G.L. 9.10.33 for 7/10/33

No references are
available in the Rev
Branch. This may be
transferred to the
Mun Br for disposal

V
(Hyde Mun Br
with Compts)
Carl

Mun. Br. for perusal
in the first instance

17/11/33
H Lang)

17/11/33

TWO E ೨-೯

4.11.33

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SIR MIRZA MAHOMED ISMAIL, K.T., C.I.E., O.B.E.,

Dewan to the Government of Mysore,

MEMORIAL OF RAJAGURUPURTHIA, SIDLAGATTA.

Most Respected Sir,

I respectfully beg to bring to your benign consideration, the following:-

Jodi Tatahalli village is an Inam villaged endowed to the Sri Avani Mutt, Mulbagal Taluk, Kolar District. It was a bechirak village hardly yielding Rs. 60/- or 70/- per annum to the Mutt. About 70 years ago, the then Sri Swamigalu of the Mutt entrusted the village to the management of my father for a lease of Rs. 100/- per annum. My father brought about 4 to 5 families to improve the village by giving them loans for bullocks, living etc. The rental of the village was being increased decenniall, until 1890 when it stood at Rs. 300/- per annum to the Mutt.

Subsequently owing to the continued failure of rains, the agriculture families were about to leave the village for want of water etc. Then Sri Swamigalu was approached to create some water facilities for drinking and cultivation purposes. His Holiness Sri Swamigalu having been unable to improve the village by sinking wells, permanently leased out the village to my father at a rental of Rs. 400/- per annum; and executed a lease deed in his favour. Accordingly he undertook the sinking of wells and the construction of the tank.

At that time one Sripathia, Shanbhog petitioned to the Government, that the permanent alienation of the

Devadaya village was irregular and that it should be cancelled The matter was enquired into and the village and improvements made were inspected by the Deputy Commissioner in the company of the Executive Engineer and the then Sri Swamigalu was also enquired into and that he reported that the action of the Sri Swamigalu was beneficial to the Mutt. The Government accordingly dismissed the petition finding no reason to interfere with this arrangement made by the Sri Swamigalu.

Being thus assured of the continuance of the lease, two tanks and 20 wells and a temple at an aggregate cost of R. 12,000/- were constructed and sunk. The debt so incurred still remains due and a heavy interest of nearly R. 1000/- is being paid. In the year 1920, the Government ordered the resumption of all the villages as having been alienated unauthorisedly. In the light of the previous Government Order, the Government after enquiry decided that the lease should continue. Thus the matter came up to Government on two occasions and the lease was continued perpetually.

The matters having thus thus, once again in the year 1930, a notice was served upon me directing me to hand over the village to Government management. I appealed to the Member of the Council for kind reconsideration in view of the previous Government Orders. No Orders were passed for 3½ years and the village was taken possession of.

Having been thus disappointed, I approached your esteemed Self on the 25th February 1933 and brought to your kind notice the gross injustice done to me and prayed that the matter should receive your kind consideration and your magnanimous self was so much pleased to express that you would look into the matter personally. But to my sad disappointment, you were called on for the greater task in this enlightened world for some greater political achievement to India and went away for the deliberations of the Joint Select

Select Committee in London.

For my petition pr sented to you, an endorsement has been issued without hearing me declining to revive the orders already passed. The Copy of the same is enclosed for your kind perusal.

Again, I submitted that a memorial praying for reconsideration of the orders after hearing me personally. I approached your benign self on 16/9/33, when you were pleased to say that you would consider my case.

But to my surprise, I have received an endorsement for the second time that my request cannot be considered. In my case, unfortunately, it has been the most unkindest cut of all.

I once again pray that my prayer to restore the village may kindly be granted in view of the enormous outlay I made on the firm understanding of enjoying the possession that was no disturbed by the Government Orders of 1903 & 1922 and if this is denied, I pray that I may kindly be ordered to be paid the amount I have invested for permanent improvement I have made ever since.

Thus, the justice so long denied to me may kindly be meted out.

31.10.33

P E T I T I O N E R.

Bank Agent,

Sidlaghatta.